

REMARKS

By the above actions, the specification and claims have been amended. Additionally, accompanying this Amendment is a sheet of substitute drawings containing an amended Fig. 2 in which the reference number "1" has been changed to -- 100 --. As filed along with the Amendment are an Information Disclosure Statement and a copy of applicants' priority document. In view of these actions and the following remarks, reconsideration of this application is requested.

The Examiner objected to the specification for the reasons indicated in item 2 of her Action. In view of these objection, the above change to Fig. 2 of the drawings has been made implemented with a corresponding change to paragraph [0020] and the changes indicated by the Examiner with respect to paragraphs [0017] and [0022] have been implemented. Thus, withdrawal of this objection is requested.

Claims 5-7, 11 and 12 have been objected to due to the presence of awkward language in these claims. All of the indicated instances of awkward language have been corrected above, so that withdrawal of this rejection is now in order.

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by embodiment of Figs. 3A & 3B of the patent to Sugawara et al. for the reasons set forth at length in item 6 of the Examiner's Action. In this regard, even though the rejection of item 6 states that "Claims 1-6 are rejected," since the last paragraph of the rejection at the bottom page 5 refers to claims 8-12, it has been presumed that rejection of claim 1-12 was intended. However, in view of the above amendments, for the following reasons, continued rejection of the claims based on this patent is inappropriate.

While the illumination device of the Sugawara et al. patent shares certain attributes with the present invention, it departs from the present invention in the following respects. Firstly, there is no image projection plane comparable to applicants' image projection plane 3 (location of object the image of which is to be projected) that is located in front of the objective lens 5, in that Sugawara et al. is lamps are not used to project an image of anything but rather are used to illuminate the RGB image modulating portions 8R, 8G, 8B of a liquid crystal display, the colors from which are combined in a prism 9 for enlargement and projection via projection (objective) lens 10 onto a screen. Put another way, the present

screen, while Sugawara et al.'s device provides light that is used to create color pixels which are projected onto, e.g., a projection TV screen, the combination of the color pixels creating the image to be viewed.

In this context, the present applicants arrange the light sources such that their partial cones of light merge in the main cone of light and converge to a common point located between the image projection plane and an exit surface of the objective lens (see Fig. 2) to increase the illumination efficiency. In this regard, the Examiner's attention is directed to paragraph [0007] where it is stated that it "is an important element of this invention that the partial cones of the light which are formed by the useful reflected light are so close to one another that they pass through the image projection plane with the image carrier which passes there as a common (main) cone of light and also penetrate the objective lens as a cone of light. No such action is needed or occurs with the device of the Sugawara et al. patent, and in fact, as can be seen in Fig. 3B of Sugawara et al., the cone of light from the projection lamp is converted into parallel light by the lenses located between the lamp and the polarizing element 5, prior to the light being reflected by mirrors onto the RGB image modulating portions 8R, 8G, 8B of the liquid crystal display.

In view of the foregoing comments, should now be apparent to the Examiner that the present invent is directed to subject matter that is significantly different than anything disclosed or even suggested by the Sugawara et al. patent. Furthermore, the independent claims have been amended to more clearly focus on these distinctions of the present invention relative to the device of the Sugawara et al. patent. As a result, continued rejection of the claims of this application on the basis of the Sugawara et al. patent is unsupportable and the outstanding rejection based thereon should be withdrawn, such action being hereby requested.

The prior art that has been cited, but not applied by the Examiner has been taken into consideration during formulation of this response. However, since this art was not considered by the Examiner to be of sufficient relevance to applying against any of the claims, no detailed comments thereon is believed to be warranted at this time.

While the present application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, should the Examiner find some issue to remain unresolved, or should any new issues arise, which could be eliminated through discussions with applicant's representative, then the Examiner is

invited to contact the undersigned by telephone in order that the further prosecution of this application can thereby be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,



David S. Safran
Registration No. 27,997

NIXON PEABODY LLP
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 800
McLean, VA 22102
Telephone: (703) 770-9300
Facsimile: (703) 770-9400